DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 195 SO 009 915

AUTHOR Barrett-Goldfarb, Minna
TITLE High School Social Studies Survey: Are Public Alternative High Schools Really Alternative? Occasional Paper Number 77-2.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook. American Historical Association Faculty Development Program.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 60p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alternative Schools; Comparative Analysis; *Curriculum; Decision Making; Educational Research; Grade 11; Political Attitudes; *School Surveys; Secondary Education; Secondary School Teachers; Social Attitudes; *Social Studies; *Teacher Attitudes; *Traditional Schools

ABSTRACT

Similarities and differences between alternative and traditional school programs are assessed through a survey of 11th grade social studies teachers in Long Island, New York. The sample consisted of 11 alternative schools and 24 traditional public high schools containing a representative sampling of upper, middle, and lower-class students. A survey instrument consisting of open-ended and closed questions was sent to all teachers. The questions focused on who determines what curriculum topics will be covered and what classroom materials will be used; coverage of curriculum topics; emphasis placed on particular topics; and usage of curriculum materials. Teachers were asked to rank how much they agreed with the facts and views presented in these materials. To determine political and social attitudes, teachers read passages and rated themselves as to how much they felt that they agreed with the passage. Teachers' responses to all survey questions are tabulated in this document. In addition, the results are discussed. Among the findings are that in alternative schools teachers and students have control of classroom curricula and a large portion of class time is devoted to topics that are different from the standard 11th grade social studies program. Thirty-two percent of the traditional teachers determine the curricula and 68% of the topics taught are those mandated by the state of New York. (Author/RM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

MAR 28 1977

ED137195

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

DR. ELI SEIFMAN, SERIES EDITOR

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES SURVEY: ARE PUBLIC ALTERNATIVE HIGH SCHOOLS REALLY ALTERNATIVE?

by

MINNA BARRETT-GOLDFARB

Occasional Paper #77-2

SP009915

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, STONY BROOK, NEW YORK
1977

PREFACE

This paper represents preliminary data from an analysis of a Long Island-wide survey of eleventh year social studies teachers in public alternative high school programs and in a random sample of traditional high school programs. The survey was intended as an instrument that would collect information in both settings so that decision-making processes, curriculum, curriculum materials, student population, teacher's educational objectives and political self-ratings for the two populations could be compared.

The data, presented item by item, tabulated from the raw scores and listings of the teachers suggest that similarities and differences between the two groups are of theoretical importance. Although the alternatives are considered separate programs administratively/academically/physically (in some cases all three), the data suggest that the actual curriculum may not be different in many respects.

The data also suggest that while alternative teachers emphasize educational objectives that tend to line them up with previous liberal school or reform movements, they are not suggestive of a population that stresses or works actively for social and political reform of institutions outside the school structure.

In terms of the political ratings of the two groups, the data suggest that both populations tend to see themselves as highly liberal and humanitarian, rather than as radical activists. Implications of these ratings and objectives are discussed, for selected aspects of the data.

The implications of this study should be of interest to educators in general and to social studies teachers in particular. The paper and the data should raise our sensitivity to a number of questions:

1. To what extent does the public alternative school experience mirror that of the free school movement?

2. To what extent are public alternatives a function of tendencies of specific school districts?

3. Are students aware of the options if options are available?

4. Are alternative schools more likely to be selected by socially aware students?

5. Do alternative school programs encourage social awareness to a greater or lesser extent than traditional settings?

This report is recommended for those who are interested in analyzing the fundamental issue of the impact of public alternative school programs on the students involved in such programs.

Dr. Eli Seifman
Series Editor, AHA/FDP Occasional Papers

HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES SURVEY:

ARE PUBLIC ALTERNATIVE HIGH SCHOOLS REALLY ALTERNATIVE?

Minna Barrett-Goldfarb

The psychology Program at

State University of New York College at Old Westbury

and

The American Historical Association

State University of New York at Stony Brook

In general the history of school reform (Mann, 1859; Cremin, 1961; Dewey, 1966) has been one that has tended to emphasize liberatarian concepts of equalization of opportunity through educational change. But, other educational historians have raised a different perspective (Katz, 1968; Callahan, 1962; Karier, 1972; Bowles and Gintis, 1976). In this second perspective reform movements, at best, have been unable to afford equality, and, at worst, have helped to maintain inequality by reproducing and justifying the social stratification that exists.

In the past ten years we have seen a resurgence in liberal reform movements both inside the public school system and outside the public institutions as well. With regard to the network of schools that have developed outside the school system, Kozol has written:

> Free Schools, by and large, begun by upper-class white people, have not been merely nonpolitical but, in many instances, conspicuously and intentionally anti-political...(Kozol, 1972, p.95).

In this regard he means that the schools have exempted themselves from a movement for social and political equality and have opted instead, for pedagogical reform for a small handful of privileged children. The national survey of Free Schools conducted by Graubard and reported in the Harvard Educational Review (1972) seems to support Kozol's analysis further, finding that 95% of the schools were similar to those above. The basic pattern for investigating the Free School Movement has generally been

either of the demographic national survey variety as with Graubard, theoretical analysis of short comings as with Kozol, and one-program analysis and/or "how-to-do-it" reports (Elizabeth Cleaners Street School People, 1972).

Parallel activity seems to have emerged with regard to the alternative school movement within the public schools. Again, national surveys (NASP, 1974), theoretical perspectives (Hopkins, 1974, Fantini, 1973; Muller and Keane, 1973), and single program focus (Anderson, 1973) appear to be the dominant mode of analysis. The "how-to" component tends to focus on curriculum development (Barr, 1974).

While this information helps to clarify internal issues, and gives demographic information and provides examples of and support for further development, a systematic survey and analysis of the impact of school reform on structural change and the role of educational reform with regard to the specific alternatives that have developed seems to be an important next step. For example, as Kozol has raised the question of the Free Schools' inadequacy to be active in wider movements for social and political change he also suggests that public alternatives are unlikely to be in the forefront of significant social and political change:

> The public-school affiliated ventures such as those I have named above, or such as Parkway School in Philadelphia or Morgan School in Washington, D.C., may constantly run skirmishes on the edges of the functions and priorities of domestication; in the long run, they can not undermine them. The school that flies the flag is, in the long run...accountable to that flag and to the power and the values, which it

> represents. This is, and must remain, the ultimate hang-up of all ventures which aspire to constitute, in one way or another, a radical alternative "within the system." (Kozol,1970, p.15)

In order to assess the actual activity of public alternatives, detailed investigations of the general class of programs need to be implemented. Divorsky (1972) reports findings of the investigation of the Berkeley experimental schools, an important step in gathering information that can establish, if possible, overall patterns and trends which will give concrete evidence for the hypothesis that school reform is unlikely to promote the kind of social and political equality that its rhetoric sometimes professes. The present report represents the preliminary data analysis for just such a research project.

In order to assess the possible impact of the alternatives, indepth investigation of the similarities and differences between alternative programs and traditional school programs could be most helpful. In looking at these differences and similarities it may be possible to 1) assess the degree to which the alternatives represent an "alternative"; 2) to establish the direction of the alternative movement in terms of its social and political possibilities; and 3) to investigate the degree to which pedagogical reform can or cannot be considered a vehicle for social reform in general.

Focus and Purposes of the Survey

The eleventh year social studies curriculum became the focus of the present investigation after lengthy talks with social studies teachers in Long Island High Schools and as a result ofmany talks with people familiar with both alternative schools and traditional school programs. The investigation by design focused on political attitudes toward social problems, concepts of activism, poverty and civil rights. These have, historically, been concepts that have had a place in previous school reform movement activity. As well, it was necessary to obtain information regarding a standard curriculum that focused on American Government and the Economy to justify to the teachers who were being selected, why we would ask them about their political identification, and question them with regard to social class differences, educational opportunity, poverty and slums. The solution was to honestly ask them about a curriculum which was supposedly developed to discuss such issues and was supposed to expose students to concepts of political and social processes and ideologies in the United States. This curriculum existed in the form of the eleventh year curriculum, outlined by the New York State Board of Regents. Guidelines for this year of social studies "suggest" that five broad topics be included in the school year. These five topics are Foreign Policy, American Government and Politics, Economy, American People, Culture and Civilization. This eleventh year culminates three years of social studies, and for many students ends with a cumulative Comprehensive

Examination. This curriculum, as far as allowing the investigators to explore relevant political and social attitudes among both the traditional and alternative high school teachers seemed appropriate as a focus for the survey.

A. The research was carried out as part of a project to assess similarities and differences between two types of high school programs (public alternative and public traditional high schools), from the perspective of the teacher with regard to the following broad areas of emphasis in the survey.

1. Decision making authority for curriculum topics and material

2. Actual topics taught and emphasis given

3. Actual materials employed and amount of agreement the teachers have with the materials they used in the classroom

4. Amount of preparation the teacher feels the material actually affords the students in terms of the Comprehensive exams offered by the New York State Board of Regents

5. Coverage of specific topics that relate to Civil Rights Movement; materials used and the amount of agreement teachers have with such material

6. The amount of agreement teachers have with a standard explanation of social class differences in educational readiness and whether or not social class differences in education are explicitly taught in the classroom

7. Student population taught with regard to scholastic levels and projections for after graduation placement (college, vocational training, other)

8. Teacher profile data including age, sex, years experience, degrees earned of the teachers.

9. Assessment of the teacher in terms of the educational objectives which are stressed in the classroom and in terms of the teachers' own self-rating with regard to political attitudes and values.

B. The material was collected for the following reasons:

1. To assess the range (variety and similarity) of both curriculum topics and materials currently employed in eleventh year social studies/science programs on Long Island

2. To compare the two samples for differences and similarities with regard to the areas of interest in the survey listed in A above

3. To determine the extent to which the public alternative high school offers a qualitatively different learning experience to a subset of students in the high school age range

The research was funded by a small grant from the American Historical Association; Faculty Development Program and from a Dissertation Grant-in-Aid from the Research Foundation of the State University of New York, both at the SUNY at Stony Brook.

It was conducted during the Spring of 1976, and data were collected through September of 1976.

METHODS

The data presented here represent the preliminary analysis of material accumulated in a Long Island wide survey of the curriculum, curriculum materials, educational objectives and political self-ratings of two groups of social studies teachers. The first group of teachers was sampled from eleventh year social studies teachers, in publicly funded district high schools. These teachers, as defined, were labelled Traditional Teachers. The second group of respondents came from publicly funded high school programs that were "mini" (small) in nature and were separated physically/administratively/academically from the traditional high school, yet which served the same census population. This group of teachers was labelled Alternative Teachers, (see NASP directory, 1974, for the working definition of public alternative high school).

The Sample

Sampling procedures were complex and will be presented separately for both samples.

Alternatives: were arrived at from two separate sources. The first and most systematic source was from a published survey conducted by the National Alternative Schools Program (1974) to obtain information with regard to demographics and extent of the public alternative school movement nationally. From this booklet and its accompanying addendum, "Applesauce" (1975) a list of the high schools on

Long Island that returned the (NASP) questionnaire was obtained. Every school was called and asked two questions. Does the school have an eleventh grade student population? And, does this population have the opportunity to study a social studies (broadly defined to include social sciences) component? If the answer to both these questions was yes, the school was put on the mailing list. It turned out every district that has such an alternative (no matter how loosely defined the concept of social studies) was not necessarily listed in the NASP directory. Word of mouth from college students actually obtained a few more programs which were quickly contacted and asked the two questions. In all, a total of 12 alternatives, fitting the bill turned up this way. Eleven were actually sampled. One district, on strike for many weeks, was difficult to reach. The switchboard operator did not let the call go through to the alternative program for a number of weeks, so initial contact could not be established. This district was regretably dropped from the sample.

Traditional school sample: Because class factors could be considered to have an effect on curriculum objectives and attitudes of teachers it was decided that a stratified random sample by class needed to be added to the traditional high schools in districts with alternatives already in the sample as a result of the alternative sample. To do this it was necessary to obtain an estimate of the economic characteristics of the school populations being served within each district. Consulting Volume Five and Six of

the Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Office 1970 Census Study, a median census tract and its accompanying income figure was developed for every school district listed in Volume Five. This then represented the median family income* of all the median family incomes reported within the entire school district and was taken as an estimate of the economic picture of the district. With this procedure each and every school district was given a median family income based on actual census data. All districts were then separated into one of three categories based on the following income categories taken from the Median Family Income Map of Long Island found in Volume Six of the Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board Census Study:

median family income reported in dollars

$20,000 and over
15,000-19,999
12,000-14,999
10,000-11,999
below 10,000

The Study sets the median family income for all of Long Island at $13,475 (or just about the midpoint of the Income Map's middle category of $12,000-14,999

*MEDIAN INCOME-is the value of the midpoint of any array of income data arranged in ascending or descending order. It is the value that divides the distribution into two equal groups; one having values above the median, one having values below the median (Volume Six Income, US Census '70, The Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board, pg 5).

**FAMILY INCOME-comprises the total income received by all persons fourteen years of age or over who were related by blood or marriage... (Volume Six, pg 3).

As a result of this information the decision was made to categorize the income levels of the school districts into three distinct classes by collapsing the two upper categories in the Census analysis into one income class so that the upper economic class school districts has a median census tract of 15,000 or more. This economic class was operationally defined as upper class and abbreviated as (U). The middle category was left in tact, for it truly seems to represent the Island median accurately according to the Census. The economic class whose median tract fell between 12,000 and 14,999 was labelled middle or (M). For the economic class labelled (L) or lower in the study, the bottom two Census study categories were collapsed and the median census tract income had to fall below 12,000 for the district to be included in the list of lowers.

With the classes defined, all school districts were listed in the appropriate economic class. In this way 21 school districts on Long Island fell into the (U) range, 51 in the (M) range and 53 in the (L) range.

The filling out of the economic class samples proceeded by subtracting the number of districts in the economic class that had alternatives, from the projected total of 8 per class.* Then the remaining number were chosen at random from the list of districts in each class.

*As a result of financial constraints, time limitations, and people power shortages, 8 districts at an average of 5 teachers per high school was projected as an appropriate sample size for statistical purposes.

In this way a list of 8 traditional high schools per economic class was generated to include in the total traditional sample.

The actual individual teacher sample size is a "best estimate" arrived at by consulting Volume Five of the Census '70 study, and from interviews with traditional school teachers on the Island with regard to the number of eleventh grade teachers there were in particular districts. A ratio of one teacher per every 5,000 listed in the population figures for each school district was arrived at using this information. Each district's population figure was rounded to the nearest whole 5,000 and this figure was divided by 5,000 to give as a determination of the number of surveys to be sent per district (with the exception of districts reporting below 7,500 who were mailed two surveys). Every school, both alternative and traditional was mailed a complimentary survey for office files.

In this way the sample size for the traditional school population was estimated at 38 for (U); 51 for (M); and 42 (L), which just about met the 40 per class criterion. For the traditional the total sample size was 131 teachers. With 11 for the alternatives, the entire sampling procedure entailed reaching 142 teachers.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument employed consisted of both open and closed ended questions, all of the pencil and paper variety (See Appendix B).

An earlier version of the survey, based partly on extensive interviews with teachers at non-sample schools helped to shape the initial format and the content of the survey. A pre-test run at a non-sample school helped to show where changes needed to be made on an item by item basis.

Some of the items for the survey were developed for the express purpose of the present study. Others came either directly from or were shaped by two other important national surveys. The first was the survey conducted by NASP (previously referred to in the present report). The second was from an Advocacy Planning Study (Rosen, 1973) which provided the basic format for the terms on the political identification item at the end of the present survey.

Method of Data Collection

Although the method for collecting this survey data was detailed and time-consuming, it was standard for a mail survey project. It consisted of an attempt at pre-mail contact with each school, a formal mail survey with explanatory letter and explicit instructions for the distribution and filling out of the survey, and a phone and mail follow-up which was aimed at insuring the distribution of the survey and its completion and return by mail. All the mail materials have been labelled and included with the survey in Appendices A - D.

Although the procedure that was followed for the alternative school differed in terms of who was actually

contacted, the actual steps were the same for both samples. For the alternative schools, where possible, direct personal contact was made with the actual teacher who was going to fill out the survey, or with the secretary or administrator of the program. Since these programs tend to be small, the formal connection was rather personal and the subject easily identifiable (one teacher per program). With the traditional sample, this was not the case. All contact went through the principal or the department chairperson. Little formal contact was established with the teachers, and in this case the target subjects were more numerous than one per school. The actual return rates are interesting, and in themselves suggest a possible area of further investigation in the social psychology of survey return behavior. Where personal contact was greatest, and the focus of the return highly specific (alternative school sample) return rates are high. With the traditionals, where contact is less direct and responsibility, perhaps diffused (more teachers, not just one to put the spotlight on) the return rate is significantly lower.

The alternative return rate was 10 out of a possible 11 (although two returned unexpectedly from one school) for a rate of return of 91%. For the traditional schools the rate of return was 31% representing 41 teachers of a possible 131. The overall return rate was 51 out of 142 or 36% for the entire survey.

Method of Analysis:

The data presented here are preliminary in nature and represent the tabulation of raw scores into means, percentages and lists of items. The material is reported item by item, separately for the two samples where appropriate and can be compared for the individual samples or can be viewed overall. In this way the reader can see the complete range of material for the entire two samples and is able to compare the two samples within each item, to observe actual differences between the offerings in the two kinds of programs.

Scope and Limitations of the Research

A tension that has existed since the outset of the research came from the contradiction between gathering broad information from a large population and obtaining more detailed information from a smaller sample of individuals. The present study tried to strike a balance between the two approaches. The attempt was made to collect a sample that would have large enough N's to perform the usual tests of significance, yet the sample was kept small enough so that less formal types of information could be collected and analyzed. Nevertheless, there was a great deal of general information about overall curriculum, materials, processes, values and attitudes that needed to be collected. This necessitated that the survey skim over areas the investigator would have liked to cover in great detail

(i.e., the teachers' own analysis of the economic system, their attitudes and opinions about radical social movements, and revolutionary tactics for social change, their definitions of radicalism, liberalism, and social change, and school reform, and the effects that the students think the educational system has on them to mention just a few).

Related to the question of breadth and depth of the actual data is the question of generalizability and applicability of this type of research. This relates to the type, or rather the mode of research which seeks to glean information about human behavior from a natural as opposed to a controlled setting, and the problems with sampling that occur in this research setting. A major obstacle in this regard was the "people power" and the related issue of funding. Had this study been part of a large national survey project, supported by a large grant from a national funding institution, it is likely that the logistics and financial burden of extending the actual sample and the follow-up procedures would have been lighter.

Despite these limitations it is believed that the general pattern this research has uncovered with regard to the process of social change through reform in education, a process which periodically has affected our opinions, attitudes and behavior as individuals and as a nation, justifies its existence. Hopefully, it will be followed by more work that delves more deeply into the processes of attitude formation and behavioral activity that lead people to promote and actively seek the radical reform of the

institutions that socialize them. As small as the present study seems, it collected a good deal of interesting information about an educational, psychological and social phenomenon that has been controversial and has affected the academics, teachers, students, parents and communities who are involved in social change through school reform. Hopefully it will help to shed light in developing a social science that goes beyond describing us as we think we ought to be, but explains why it is we act as we do.

RESULTS

The results are reported on an item by item basis, as percentages tabulated from raw scores, or as listings of all materials or topics or in means tabulated from raw scores.

Question 1. Asked teachers to report, who has MAJOR responsibility for determining what curriculum topics will be covered in your classes or with your students during the year?

Results: (% teachers responding)	% Traditional	% Alternative
a. individual students	0	0
b. students as a whole	0	30
c. individual teacher	32	20
d. district administration	10	0
e. department meeting	5	0
f. other:		
New York State	22	0
students and teacher	0	50
individual teacher and department	12	0
individual teacher and New York State	7	0
administration and department	2.4	0
department and New York State	5	0
no response	2.4	0

Question 2. Asked teachers to report, who has the MAJOR responsibility for deciding what basic curriculum materials (reading) will be assigned (or suggested) to the students?

Results:	% Traditional	% Alternative
a. individual student	0	0
b. students as a whole	0	10
c. individual teacher	78	60
d. district administration	0	0
e. department meeting	10	10
f. other:		
students and teacher	2.4	20
individual teacher and department	5	0
individual teacher and administration	2.4	0
no response	2.4	0

Question 3. Teachers were asked here to list the broad curriculum topics that were covered during the entire year with students, and then were asked to rank each topic for the amount of time and emphasis placed on each topic. The rating scale is as follows:

3= a great amount of time and emphasis
2= a moderate amount of time and emphasis
1= a little amount of time and emphasis

A complete list of all topics follows in Table 1.

Question 3

TABLE 1. TOPICS LISTED BY ALL TEACHERS

TOPIC TRADITIONAL LIST	NUMBER RESPONDING	TIME AND EMPHASIS
Foreign Affairs Policy	37	2.50
American Government	35	2.76
American People	31	2.35
Economics	33	2.60
Culture and Civilization	7	1.43
Total New York State (Topics listed for New York State curriculum for Eleventh Year)	143 = 68%	2.47
U.S. History	14	2.07
Social Control & Civil Liberty	5	2.40
Problems in U.S. Society	4	2.50
Reform Movements in the U.S.	3	2.67
Twentieth Cent. Domestic Issues	4	1.75
Current Events	2	2.00
Industrialization	2	2.00
World History	2	1.67
Revolution	1	3.00
War and Peace	5	2.50
Future	1	3.00
Comparative Systems	1	2.00
Presidential Politics	1	3.00
Creativity in America	1	1.00
Historiography	1	3.00
Consumerism	1	2.00
Social Science	6	2.11
Social Welfare, Poverty	4	2.36
Mass Media and Propaganda	3	1.33
Consumerism	1	2.00
Law in America	1	2.00
Dissent in America	1	3.00
How to write papers, exams	1	1.00
School Problems	1	2.00
Total Number of traditional teachers reporting non-mandated New York State curriculum topics	69 = 32%	2.04

TOPIC ALTERNATIVE LIST	NUMBER RESPONDING	TIME AND EMPHASIS
Foreign Policy	1	3.00
American Government	4	2.50
Culture and Civilization	1	2.00
Immigration	1	1.00
Total number and % of all Alternative school teachers reporting New York State curriculum topics	7 = 14%	2.28
U.S. History	1	3.00
Historical Incidents	1	2.00
Social Problems	1	3.00
BiCentennial America	1	3.00
Current Political Situation	2	3.00
Current Events	2	2.00
Geography	1	1.00
Rise and Fall of Nazi Germ.	1	1.00
Comparative Religions	2	2.50
Holocaust	1	3.00
Soc. Studies for Daily Life	1	2.00
Utopian Societies	1	2.00
Presidential Politics	2	2.50
Watergate	1	3.00
Historiography oral Hist.	3	2.67
Moral Dilemmas	1	3.00
Social Sciences	8	2.04
Career Education	1	3.00
Quiz Shows	1	1.00
Totalitarianism	1	3.00
Law and Criminal Justice	2	2.50
Philosophy	1	3.00
Writing for Social Studies	1	2.00
In-School Incidents	1	2.00
Long Island History	1	2.00
Asian Countries	1	2.00
Modern Middle East	1	1.00
Diagnostic Evaluation	1	1.00
End-of-Year Evaluation	1	1.00
Individual Social Projects	1	2.00
Total Number and % of all Alternative Teachers reporting non-mandated NYS curriculum	44 = 86%	2.14

Question 4. Asked teachers to list the one broad curriculum topic from question 3 that they felt they spent the most time and placed the most emphasis on, and then, to list the five to eight concepts they stressed in teaching that topic.

Results: Since it would be lengthy to report all of these answers, we have selected a random sample from both program categories and have presented them below.

Alternatives

Moral Dilemmas:
- justice
- morals
- fairness
- conflict
- adjudication

Law:
- Why is there law-need
- A society structures law out of experience-needs
- How and why legal systems vary
- Lawering-judging-how trained, rewarded
- Crime and punishment
- Civil law-criminal law
- Costs and statistics
- Reform proposals

Traditionals

Reform Movements in America
- Pupilism
- Progressivism
- status anxiety
- ideology
- dissent
- agrarian democracy

Economic and Political Development
- Mercantilism
- Corporate Capitalism
- monetary and fiscal policy
- industrialism
- labor relations
- Progressive Era
- factors of production
- scarcity

Jacksonian Period
- frontier thesis
- democracy
- individualism
- reform
- laissez-faire
- Jacksonianism
- Jeffersonianism

Economic Development of US
- role of government in the economy
- laissez-faire
- social protest
- Capitalism
- Socialism
- work ethic
- welfare state

Question 5. Asked the teachers to list the curriculum materials that they felt were the most important for their students to read or to learn from. They were asked to list the most important first. (See Table 2, for list)

Results: We found that theachers in general listed the following types of materials:

Listed First (Listed Second in Parenthesis)

	Texts, Series or Documents	Newspapers, Magazines	Popular Books	Other, media Dittos, Library
% Traditional responding in category	88 (51)	12 (28)	2.4 (0)	5 (24)
% Alternative responding in category	20 (20)	0 (20)	50 (30)	30 (20)

Question 6. This question was actually joined to question 5. It asked the teachers to rank just how much he/she agreed with the facts and views presented in the curriculum materials listed in question 5. They were instructed to use the following scale:

5 = Agree Strongly
4 = Agree
3 = Undecided
2 = Disagree
1 = Disagree Strongly

Results: Traditional school teachers rated themselves at 4.22 for all materials.
Alternative school teachers rated themselves at 3.88 for all materials.

Question 7. Asked the teachers to rate, on a five point scale just how well the materials that they listed in question 5 actually prepared their students for the New York State Comprehensive Exam that many students take after the Eleventh Year social studies course.

5 = Extremely Adequate
4 = Adequate
3 = Undecided
2 = Inadequate
1 = Extremely Inadequate

Results: Traditional school teachers rated the material at a level of 3.85.
Alternative school teachers rated the material at a level of 4.10.

Question 7. Also asked the teachers the following: Do most of your students take the New York State Comprehensive Exam at the end of the eleventh year?

Results:	YES	NO
Traditional % teachers responding	79	21
Alternative % teachers responding	20	80

Comment: This is an interesting difference especially when the alternative teachers are reporting that their material is slightly higher than adequate from their perspective in preparing the students for such an exam. In fact, they report that they perceive their material as more adequate for this task than do the traditional school teachers who claim that many more of their students actually take the exam.

Question 8. Asked the teachers to answer Yes or No to the following question: Do you cover the Civil Rights Movement during the year?

Results:	YES	NO
% Traditionals	88	12
% Alternatives	60	40

Question 9. Asked the teachers to list the curriculum materials that they felt were most important for the students to read or learn from with regard to the Civil Rights Movement. As in question 5, it asked the teacher to list the most important of two choices, first. (See Table 3 for list)

Results: As in question 5, we are reporting the results in terms of the % of teachers who responded in a particular category, with the first number representing the material listed first and the number in parenthesis (second listed results).

	Tests Series Documents	Newspapers Magazines	Popular Books	Other: media Ditto, Library, etc.	No Response
% Traditional teachers responding in category	44 (34)	7 (2.4)	10 (2.4)	25 (29)	15 (27)
% Alternative teachers responding in category	20(10)	0 (0)	20 (10)	20 (10)	50 (70)

TABLE 3. MATERIALS LISTED IN QUESTION 3

List C - Traditional Schools

Listed First	Listed Second
Black Experience in American AEP	Newspapers
Rise of the American Nation	Magazines
Film Clips: Which Way U.S.A. (Time-Life)	New History of the U.S. (Fenton)
From Africa to the U.S. and Then Goode	American Gov't (Magruder)
Video-Attack on Terror	Self-generated
Manchild in a Promised Land (Brown)	Films
People Make a Nation: (Sandlen, et.al.)	Handouts
Self-generated materials	Film: A History of the Negro in America (all 3 reels)
Shaping of America	Civil Rights (Parker, et. al.)
Negro Views of America (Life Reprints)	Eyewitness: Negro in American History
Negro Views of America AEP	Magazines
Great Issues (Hofstadter)	Fini and Brown
Nat Turner's Narrative	Brown vs. Board of Education
Filmstrip Kits	Net Videotape: Prince Edward County
The Negro Struggle for Equality in America (Ames)	The Black American Experience
Current news file: Newspapers	Negro Struggle for Equality (Ames)
Film: Lost, Stolen or Strayed	Race and Education (AEP)
Values Clarification Story: High School Racial Incident	White Problem in America (article)
The Social Setting of Intolerance (Mandelbaum)	An American Dilemma (Myrdal)
The Wasp (Horwitz)	Negro in American History (AEP)
Constitution	Viewpoints USA
Films	Civil Rights legislation
Library Research Project	Rise of the American Nation
Newspapers	

List D - Alternative Schools

Magazines	Supreme Court decisions
Negro in America (Scott, Foresman)	Teacher & student generated materials
Gideon's Trumpet (Presidential Commission's Report)	Autobiography of Malcolm X
Counselling sessions to change attitudes	

Comment: Notice the higher No Response rate, than in question 5, especially in the alternative category. But, remember that Alternative teachers report 60% not teaching this as a topic. Their average rate of non responding, averaged across the two choices is 60%, so it really is not surprising. Again, where they do respond, there appears to be less reliance on text, document and series materials.

Question 9. This question also asked the teachers to rate just how much they actually agreed with the facts and views presented in the material they listed as using to teach the Civil Rights Movement. The scale that was reported in question 6 was used again. Please refer to it if necessary.

Results: Traditional school teachers rated themselves at 4.12 for the materials.
Alternative school teachers rated themselves at 4.00 for the materials.
The number of actual respondents for this question was quite low in both cases with only 30 of 41 traditionals and 3 out of 10 alternative teachers making a judgment for this question.

Question 9. Question 9 also asked the teachers to rate the materials that they listed for teaching the Civil Rights Movement in terms of how well they thought the materials prepared their students for the New York State Comprehensive Exam mentioned in question 7. Again, refer to question 7 to see the scale that was used.

Results: Again the number of teachers who responded to this question about the materials that they used for this topic was small. Two of 10 for the alternative teachers and 27 of 41 for the traditionals made a judgment on the quality of preparation that these materials provided for such an exam.

Traditional teachers rated the materials at 4.00.
Alternative teachers rated the materials at 3.00.

Question 10. Asked the teachers to rate themselves in terms of how much they themselves felt that they agreed with the following passage from a commonly used eleventh year social studies text.

Question 10 continued

> "Problems occur even after schools are integrated. For instance, a middle-class child learns from books, toys and visits to friends or relatives, and the conversation of well educated parents. Thus, before he enters the first grade, he has already had some education. A slum child, on the other hand, has few of these advantages. His poor parents must struggle hard to earn a living. Often they have little education themselves."

Please circle the number below that best expresses how much you agree with the passage.

Agree Strongly	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
5	4	3	2	1

Results: Overall, the average of all teachers fell at 3.19 which is just about at the moderate agree level towards the agree side of the scale.

Traditional school teachers rated themselves, on the average at, 3.27 which is about at the moderate agree level on the agree side.

Alternative school teachers rated themselves, on the average at 2.9 which is just about at the moderate agree rating.

Question 11. Asked teachers to briefly explain why they either agreed or disagreed with the passage.

Results: Again, as with question 4, to report all answers would be lengthy. A random sample of explanations was drawn from three categories of response: teachers who rated themselves at 1 or 2 either strongly disagreeing or disagreeing; teachers rating themselves at 3 or moderate; and in the third category, teachers rating themselves at 4 or 5, agreeing or agreeing strongly.

Some of the comments follow:

Rating themselves at 1 or 2, strongly disagree, disagree

"This passage defines education as a middle-class phenomenon taught by books, toys, education with well-educated parents. Education is more experiential than that. A ghetto child has a rich and

Question 11 continued

valuable experience in LIFE which molds values and decisions. Poor and struggling parents could be a tremendous example, but it isn't reinforced by public education."

"There is an assumption there that middle-class parents always care about their children, while slum parents do not demonstrate love and concern".

"Slum child" learns as well from books, toys, etc. Different results may occur due to different books, values, friends, conversations, etc. What a "slum child" may learn or "know" could be different, but not necessarily inferior."

Rating selves at 3, moderate

"Economic conditions do influence the level of achievement that can be reached by an average child."

"It's too general, but I do agree to some extent except the ghetto culture is given no respect at all."

"It's too, too general. But it's true that slum kids don't care about education. Many middle-class children don't either..., but it doesn't seem to matter because the society is set up to appreciate them."

Rating selves at 4 or 5, agree, strongly agree

"Passage is essentially correct in my opinion"

"I agree because my experience and logical reasoning affirm the truth, it seems obvious."

"Little formal education is no excuse for lack of communication. No matter how hard parents work, there should always be time for family activities. Maybe less drinking and fooling around."

"Coleman report and other research supports this view."

Comment: For those of you who are interested in exploring other perspectives with regard to educational differences among social classes, you might want to look at some interesting and important materials.

Question 12. Asked teachers to respond YES or NO to the question, Do you cover educational differences among different social classes?

Results:	YES	NO
Traditional % responding in category	83	17
Alternative % responding in category	90	10

Question 13. Asked teachers to describe who their students are in terms of the level of teaching and in terms of what students are likely to do after high school.

Results:

	Above Average	Average	Below Average	No Response
% Traditional responding in category	23	58	10	6
% Alternative responding in category	39	31	23	10

With regard to what students do after graduating high school:

All above average children for both traditional and alternative schools are reported as going to 4 year colleges with only one traditional school teacher providing no response.

For average children, traditional school teachers report 33% that their children go to 4 year colleges, 39% report their students going to 2 year colleges, and 11% report that their average students go out and work. For alternative school teachers of average students, there appear to be a difference, 75% report that their students go to 4 year colleges, with 25% reporting that their students go to 2 year colleges.

In the below average category, the report is as follows: Forty percent of the traditionals report that their students

Question 13 continued

go to work, and 60% of those responding in this category did not explain what these below average students do after high school. For the alternatives, 33% report that students go to 2 year colleges, and 67% report no response.

Question 14. Asked the teacher to describe the type of school that he/she teaches in.

Results:

	% Traditional	% Alternative
a. the only high school in the district.	62	0
b. a small mini high school within a larger district high school.	0	60
c. a small mini high school separated from a larger district high school.	0	10
d. our school has both a mini school and larger district school. I teach in district school.	14	0
e. other two district schools and alternatives	16	20
no response	5	0
I teach in both mini school and district school.	0	20

This represents the results from the question section of the survey. The next section of results comes from the Personal Data Sheet which asked teachers questions about themselves with regard to age, experience, sex, degree attainment, and to rate themselves with regard to certain educational objectives and general objectives.

PERSONAL DATA - Averaged for all teachers, differences in groups are negligible.

AGE	SEX: Male-Female		SOCIAL STUDIES YEARS TAUGHT	%BA	%MA	%HIGHEST DEGREE
38	75%	25%	12	14	80	6

EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES: Below you will find a list of educational objectives. Please indicate to what extent you feel each one reflects your own educational objectives.

Extremely Accurate				Not at all Accurate
5	4	3	2	1

Results:

OBJECTIVE

		Average Rating Traditional	Alternative
cognitive	(stress formal thinking).....	4.37	3.50
perception	(sensory awareness).....	3.75	3.90
moral	(stress what is right to believe)..	3.52	4.00
activism	(political and social action).....	3.59	3.40
aesthetic	(stress on individual talent).....	3.73	3.50
affective	(emotional needs and feelings).....	3.56	4.40
basic skill	development.....	4.17	3.70

Descriptive Adjectives: Here are some adjectives people sometimes use to describe themselves. Would you indicate to what extent each is accurate in your case according to the following scale.

3 = extremely accurate
2 = moderately accurate
1 = not at all accurate

Results:

Adjective	Average Rating Traditional	Alternative
moderate	1.66	2.40
conservative	1.46	1.30
radical	1.55	1.80
democrat	2.40	2.40
activist	2.03	1.80
humanist	2.59	2.80
straight	2.18	2.10
hippie	1.21	1.40
reformist	2.19	2.50
revolutionary	1.34	1.50
indifferent	1.18	1.70
pluralist	2.50	1.90
liberal	2.56	2.30
radical right	1.03	1.10
socialist	1.59	1.60
participatory democrat	1.98	2.10
radical liberal	1.38	1.40
counter-culture	1.15	1.60
republican	1.51	1.20

DISCUSSION

The preliminary analysis of the data suggests some interesting findings. In the first place, it is clear that alternative school teachers report that they and their students have control of the classroom curriculum. On question one 70% respond that they alone, or with their students decide the topics for class. In actually looking at the topics they list in question 5 it turns out that only 14% of all the topics listed fall into the mandated New York State topics of the eleventh year social studies curriculum, whereas 86% are otherwise. It appears that a large portion of the classroom time is devoted to topics that are outside the structure of the standard eleventh year social studies program.

With regard to the traditional school teachers, on question one they report a different set of figures. While 32% report themselves as having the major decision making authority for the curriculum, all other categories they report, while they may include input from the teacher are clearly at administrative levels. And, it is interesting to notice that none of the teachers in this group report student authority for this decision. As for the actual topics listed in question 5, 68% of these fall into the mandated by State category while 32 % are otherwise.

Thus, it seems as if alternatives are doing much more "alternative" education for their report of 14% of their topics being state mandated eleventh year social studies, and 86% of their topics being "alternative to mandated topics" seems largely different. But if a close examination of the topics listed in the non New York State mandated topics is made, (consult Table 1) a fair amount of overlap between the topics in the alternative and traditional lists can be observed. U.S. History, social problems, current events, topics of World History, comparative systems, utopian societies, presidential policies, historiography, social science (which included, psychology, sociology, animal behavior, group dynamics), law in America, how to write papers, in school problems and others, the language of which is more variable, but implications of which may be similar, are in the lists for both groups of teachers, in the topic category considered outside the five-topic curriculum of the state-mandated eleventh year social studies program.

While alternatives seem to be stressing social science and broad current events topics, so too do the traditional teachers list these with some frequency. Thus, the traditionals may be spending less time per topic, but may be offering a wider range of topics, with most traditional

teachers offering a good sampling of state-mandated topics (68% of all topics they listed fell in this category) and also an offering of the social science and broad current topics (listing 32% of all topics in this category). The alternatives, on the other hand, are offering few state-mandated topics. Notice, however, where they do report them (14% of all topics listed), they are similar to those offered by traditionals, as is expected since only five state-mandated topics exist in this category. The alternatives may be focusing in depth on a set of topics that the traditionals tend to explore lightly.

This information is interesting, especially when combined with the input from questions 7 and 13. In question 7, 79% of the traditional teachers respond that their students take the New York State Comprehensive Exam that is offered to students completing the high school social studies sequence. The alternative teachers respond 20% yes to that question. For students in the category reported as average by the teachers, the "alternative" students are reported as far more likely than "traditionals" to attend college. Normally, the "no-takers" of the standard regents and comprehensive state exams are students who are not "geared" for academic programs, yet, even though the alternative students do not take the standard state exams, they are still reported by their teachers as likely to go on to college, as a group. In general, is the

intensive social science of the "alternative program", some form of within district tracking? That is, the information at first glance seems contradictory. On the one hand, alternatives at first glance seem to have a different program, far less involved with the mandated eleventh year social studies curriculum. On the other hand, topic overlap in both mandated and non-mandated lists for both groups is sizeable. However, average students in alternative programs, who may not take the standard state exams are more likely to go to four or two year colleges than their traditional counterparts. While the answer is not forthcoming in the present analysis, the information is suggestive and calls for further investigation.

With regard to the curriculum materials used, the results are interesting, especially when viewed with the actual listings of question 5 (see Table 2). Both groups of teachers report being central to the choice of materials, with traditionals reporting 78% and alternatives 60% that they have the major decision with regard to the materials that they actually use to explain and explore the topics they listed.

Yet, the actual listings of materials might suggest otherwise for the traditional teachers. When asked to list the materials that they use, they responded 88% (first listed material) and 51% (second listed) that they used standard texts, social studies series and or documents. A consultation with Table 2 - Traditional, should help the

reader to see the accuracy of these percentages. While traditionals claim to "pick" the materials that they use in class to cover the topics they listed, it may be that, although they have the final decision, the original list they pick from is actually restricted. This gives them the sense of choice, when in actuality the range of perspectives and viewpoints from which they pick is limited to what the department has to choose from, hence basically standard high school materials. Looking at the list of materials generated by the alternative teachers gives a different image. In the case of these teachers it may be more accurate to conclude that they are making a direct choice with regard to the materials used in the classroom. A look at Table 2 - Alternative helps to explain the conclusion. These books are less text-type. In fact, only 20% of the first listed materials and 20% of the second listed materials in question five fit into the category of text, series or document. This list does appear to be one that could be generated by teachers and/or students, with little administrative input.

As to whether the content of these materials is significantly different only a first hand content analysis of the materials could yield an answer. But, by "different", perhaps here again Kozol offers some concrete or at least suggestive advice:

> In certain of the more sophisticated classrooms in some of the innovative and experimental public schools, children are now provided with an opportunity to research and explore, without apparent supervision, into a seemingly diverse array of books and films, of tapes and magazines and other types of resource data. If we look, however, what we find in almost every case is that the seemingly diverse resources that the school purveys are not very different from the unimportant options of mass magazines, of TV networks, or at the very most, of the commercialized rebellion of the counter-culture (1972, p.99).

Another instructive response in the present survey was the pattern established with question 10. This question asked the teachers to agree or disagree with a paragraph that emphasized that pre-school differences in educational background explain school performance; differences between children of different social classes, which in turn, explains why integration is so difficult.

> "Problems occur even after schools are integrated. For instance, a middle-class child learns from books, toys and visits to friends or relatives, and the conversation of well-educated parents. Thus, before he enters the first grade, he has already had some education. A slum child, on the other hand, has few of these advantages. His poor parents must struggle hard to earn a living. Often they have little education themselves."

The average response among alternative teachers was 2.9, which is one tenth of one point from the middle rating of 3 (moderate agreement with the paragraph). The average response for the traditional school teachers was 3.27, or just slightly above the 3 point rating on the scale. One possibility for the difference in means could be that,

while in general, alternatives are not providing an attitude of disagreement with the passage, they are agreeing less strongly. No alternative teacher rated their agreement at (5) or strong, as did a number of traditionals. So, while the patterns are similar, alternatives may agree less strongly, while still, in general, tending to agree. But, while the difference between these groups is .37, the important aspect of this question is that the teachers as a whole tend to agree moderately with the passage as it stands. The paragraph supports the commonly held sociological and psychological assumption that the differences that occur in school experience come from the cultural inferiority of the "slum child's" early childhood experience. Because the parents are poor, they do not stimulate the child, or the stimulation they do give the child is inferior. Another interpretation of such differences stresses that the problem is not so much that the child's experience is inferior, but that it is not considered important by mainstream society; and/or also the reason that the children are getting less than their share is not so much that their parents won't give it to them, but that the society has systematically refused to do so (Ryan, 1972). While there are individuals in this sample who do reject the paragraph and offer as their explanation the above reasons, they are just as likely to occur in the traditional school group as with the alternatives. And while there are

those individuals who tend to emphasize the failure of the individuals at the mercy of the system (including people who rate themselves as agreeing), a majority in both groups tend not to explore the possibility of systemic failure and seemingly blame the poor themselves and at least moderately agree with the paragraph.

In this regard the ratings on the educational objectives and the political identification component lend support to the hypothesis that school reform is unlikely to promote active social and political redistribution. Turning to the educational objectives, both groups rate themselves as stressing all objectives at least at a 3.40 rating, which means that the teachers view these as applying to them at least moderately. This, however, should not seem out of the ordinary in this regard. These are teachers, and the objectives are among those teachers who might feel they should be relating in class. They might be unwilling to use the lower part of the scale because they feel these are objectives that they should stress, especially if they are being presented on a survey from the offices of the Stony Brook Chapter of the American Historical Association. We should then, expect that on the whole the teachers will stick to the upper part (3, 4, 5) of the rating scale for the most part.

A brief summary of the means for each objective and the rank order (from highest (1) to lowest (7)) of these means for each group follows:

TRADITIONAL			ALTERNATIVE		
1.	cognitive	4.37	1.	affective	4.40
2.	basic skills	4.17	2.	moral	4.00
3.	perception	3.75	3.	perception	3.90
4.	aesthetic	3.73	4.	basic skills	3.70
5.	activism	3.59	5.	cognitive	3.50
6.	affective	3.56	6.	aesthetic	3.50
7.	moral	3.52	7.	activism	3.40

When the means are ranked in this fashion, an instructive priority pattern emerges for the two groups. The highest mean for the traditionals is 'cognitive' at 4.37, with 'basic skills' next at 4.17. Alternative rated the two 'cognitive' and 'skills' components at 3.50 and 3.70 respectively. The rank order of these two means for the alternatives was 5 and 4. The alternatives rated 'affective' at 4.40 and 'moral' at 4.00 as the two highest objectives, yet traditionals on the same two objectives had means of only 3.56 for affect and 3.52 for moral. The rank order of these two means was therefore, 6 and 7. As for activism, the alternatives as mentioned above rated themselves at 3.40 or the lowest of all means with the traditionals rating activism at 3.59 or the 5th lowest of all their means.

So the traditionals tend to rate themselves highest on the skills components objectives (again this is interesting especially with regard to question 7 and question 13 as discussed at the beginning of the discussion section). The alternatives tend to stress the kinds of objectives that are thought to follow along with pedagogical reform, affective components and moralism. Yet, they both

tend to rate social and political action, activism, near the bottom of their priorities with alternatives rating it lowest of all objectives. While moralism is viewed as important for the alternative teachers, and while emotional needs and feelings are stressed more highly as well, activism is viewed as least important for the alternatives. While this might be expected, it seems to lend support for the theoretical position that alternative education is not likely to be an avenue for restructuring social and political inequity.

Moving to the political identification item helps to further support the position that school reform, while possibly liberal and humanitarian, is unlikely a mechanism for, nor consists of a population of people actively engaged in fighting for redistribution of economic, social and political power.

The entire spread of means for this item was from 1.03 (radical right- traditional) to 2.80 (humanist - alternative) or 1.77 points. Means falling one third of the way between the spread or from 1.03 to 1.61 were categorized as low identification components, those means falling between 1.62 to 2.20 are considered moderate, and those at 2.21 to 2.80 fall into the category of accurate identification components as rated by the teachers themselves. In this way, the means and their components fall into the following patterns for both groups.

	Traditional		Alternative		
accurate	humanist	2.59	humanist	2.80	accurate
	liberal	2.56	reformist	2.50	
	pluralist	2.50	moderate	2.40	
	democrat	2.40	democrat	2.40	
			liberal	2.50	
moderate	reformist	2.19	particip. dem.	2.10	moderate
	straight	2.18	straight	2.10	
	activist	2.03	activist	1.80	
	particip. dem.	1.98	radical	1.80	
	moderate	1.66	indifferent	1.70	
low	socialist	1.59	counter-culture	1.60	low
	radical	1.55	socialist	1.60	
	republican	1.51	revolutionary	1.50	
	conservative	1.46	hippie	1.40	
	radical liberal	1.38	radical liberal	1.40	
	revolutionary	1.34	conservative	1.30	
	hippie	1.21	republican	1.20	
	indifferent	1.18	radical right	1.10	
	counter-culture	1.59			
	radical right	1.03			

In this sense, the two populations seem not to vary greatly in self-description. Both tend to see themselves as highly liberal and humanitarian, moderately active, straight, radical, and not at all revolutionary or socialist, conservative or republican.

In general, the data obtained from this survey support the idea that radical reform of the school system and the social system that it serves is not likely to follow from liberal educational reform, through either the liberal methods, varied curriculum or attitudes of the well-intentioned people involved. But, if this is not the role of the alternative school program, then what might it be? Given the history of school reform (Bowles and Gintis, 1976), does the alternative reach a limited, select and by and

large, already privileged group of students and does it help to insure their place in the already highly stratified social and economic system? Where are alternative schools found? What is the nature of the school district and its larger district high school? These are important questions and they point to the need for further analysis of the present data and for future research that attempts to obtain a nationwide picture of the process. In this way, the additions and inhibitions that school reform tends to bring to social change in the United States may be openly and honestly assessed.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B.R. Where the responsibility is on the kids; alternative school in Cinnamonson, N.J. School Management, 17, 27-29, November, 1973.

Barr, R.D.(ed) Social studies in alternative schools: symposium. Social Education, 38, 235-255, March, 1974.

Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert. Schooling in capitalist America, and the contradictions of economic life. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Callahan, Raymond. Education and the cult of efficiency. A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Cremin, Lawrence. The transformation of the schools progressivism in American education, 1876-1957. (1st ed.) New York: Knopf, 1961.

Dewey, John. Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Divorky, D. Berkeley's experimental schools. Saturday Review of Education, 55, 44-51, October, 1972.

Elizabeth Cleaners Street People. Starting your own school: the story of an alternative high school. New York: Random House, 1972.

Fantini, M.D. What, why and where of the alternatives movement. National Elementary School Principle [illegible] 52, 14-22, April, 1973.

Freemon, S.S. Why free schools fail. Educational Digest, 38, 17-20, December 1972.

Graubard, Allen. The free school movement. Harvard Educational Review, 42, 351-373, August, 1972.

Hopkins, R.L. Open schools: free schools. School and Community, 60, 28, March 1974.

Karier, Clarence. Testing for order and control in the liberal corporate state. Educational Theory, 22, Spring, 1972.

Katz, Michael. The irony of early school reform: educational innovation in mid-nineteenth century Massachusetts. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Kopplemen, Lee (director). Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board 1970 Census Study, 5, 6, February, 1973.

Kozol, Jonathan. Free Schools. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

Mann, Horace. The republic and the school: Horace Mann on the education of free men. Cremin, Lawrence (ed.). Classics in Education No. 1. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.

Mayo, Michael; Cotton, Peter; Homestead, Kerry; Kirousis, Chris; Matteson, Lynn. Public alternative schools, 1974:a national directory. National Alternative Schools Program, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1974.

Miller, S. and Keene, J. Alternative schools: 10 reasons why they aren't for everyone. National Schools, 41, 39-41, June, 1973.

Rosen, Sharon. Advocacy planning: the limits of pluralistic reform. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1973.

Ryan, William. Blaming the Victim. (1st ed.) New York: Pantheen Books, 1971.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Letter to Chairpersons of Social Studies Departments

Appendix B: Letter to all teachers to be surveyed
Explanatory letter sent to all teachers directly-alternatives or through department chairpersons-traditionals

Appendix C: Survey Materials including
- Survey Materials List
- Special Instructions
- High School Social Studies Survey
- Personal Data Sheet

Appendix D: Follow-up letter

May 1976

Appendix: A

EXPLANATORY LETTER TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS-TRADITIONAL SAMPLE

Dear Department Chairperson;

We are conducting a simple survey of Long Island area high schools in regard to certain aspects of curriculum development. Our study focuses on the content of American Studies or Social Studies as it may be called in different schools. (Sometimes 10th usually 11th year curriculum).

We are asking the department heads to please read the letter thet is attached to the explanation we are now giving you so that you can see what it is we are asking for in this particular study.

We need you to distribute the survey, one to each of the teachers in your department that teachs the subject of American Studies or Social Studies, regardless of class(honors, ave.)

Each survey is self explanatory and we ask that you not collect them when the teachers are done. Each comes with its own separate return mailer so that each teacher can return the completed survey on their own.

We ask that you distribute the survey materials rapidly upon receiving them for the school semester is quickly coming to a close.

A large number of school districts are being sampled and are already participating so the final results should be interesting for us all. Please see on the explanation letter that every participant receives a copy of the final report.

We think the survey is short but concrete and informative and that your participation will help us have a truly representative picture of the teaching approaches and materials currently being used in our high schools.

Sincerely yours,

Minna Goldfarb

Minna Goldfarb
Faculty Development Program
American Historical Society
and Social Science in the High School Project
Social Psychology
both at SUNY at Stony Brook, New York

P.S. Please note the little postcard which you can drop in the mail when the packet arrives. This tells us that the mail service had done its work.

Appendix B

EXPLANATORY LETTER SENT TO ALL TEACHERS DIRECTLY-ALTERNATIVES OR THROUGH DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS-TRADITIOANLS

May, 1976

Dear Eleventh Year Social Studies Teacher:

During the past ten years both the approaches to teaching social studies and the materials used in exploring particular themes have undergone some diversification.

The Faculty Development Project (American Historical Association) and the Social Sciences in the High Schools Project (Social Psychology), both at the State University at Stony Brook, are engaged in a joint effort.

On the next few pages you will see fourteen questions that ask about the general approach, themes, and materials you use. It ends with regard to specific topics, concepts, and materials. A short one-page data sheet follows.

A complete report of the survey findings will be published during the Fall of 1976. Every participant can receive a copy by filling out and returning the enclosed stamped and addressed postcard. (Your returned survey will not have your name or address on it.) The survey results will also be published in the Education Resources Information Center Clearing House (ERIC/CHes).

The success of the survey depends, of course, upon the participation of the teachers themselves. So, we want to thank you in advance for taking the time to participate. We hope you will find it both enjoyable and informative and the findings helpful.

Sincerely,

Minna Goldfarb
Faculty Development Program
Social Science Project
SUNY at Stony Brook

Dr. Dana Bramel
Social Science Project
Social Psychology Program
SUNY at Stony Brook

Dr. Eli Seifman
Faculty Development Program
American Historical Association
SUNY at Stony Brook

Appendix: C SURVEY MATERIALS:PLEASE FIND IN YOUR PACKET

1. A letter explaining the purpose of the study
2. A special instruction paragraph
3. A pre-stamped and return-addresses postcard Please mail this if you wish to obtain a final report booklet
4. Survey and attached personal data sheet
5. Pre-stamped and return addressed mailer

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED STUDY BY DROPPING IT IN THE MAILS IN THE RETURN MAILER ON OR BEFORE JUNE 14.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTION PARAGRAPH

Our survey is being sent to a broad variety of educational programs in the Long Island Public High Schools. This makes it very exciting for us.

However, as a result, our survey is rather concrete and standardized. So, first answer all the questions to the best of your ability.

In case you feel the completed survey does not fully reflect the character of your social studies program, please use the space after question 14 to explain as fully as you see fit.

We also welcome your comments.

For the Project,

Minna Goldfarb

Minna Goldfarb

HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES SURVEY

1. Who has the MAJOR responsibility for determining what curriculum topics will be covered in your classes or with your students during the year?

   a. individual students
   b. students as a whole
   c. individual teacher
   d. district administration
   e. department meeting
   f. other:_____

2. Who has the MAJOR responsibility for deciding what basic curriculum materials (reading) will be assigned (or suggested) to the students?

   a. individual student
   b. students as a whole
   c. individual teacher
   d. district administration
   e. department meeting
   f. other:_____

3. Below you will see both spaces and numbers. First, on the spaces make a list of the broad curriculum topics that you will have covered with your students this year. A variety of answers is possible. Examples might be - american government, social protests, foreign policy or might be different course titles in the case of schools where mini-course structures are now in progress.

3	2	1	_____	3	2	1	_____
3	2	1	_____	3	2	1	_____
3	2	1	_____	3	2	1	_____
3	2	1	_____	3	2	1	_____

You may fill all the spaces or you may have only four or five topics that you cover.

Second, please describe how much time and emphasis you feel that you spent on each topic (or mini-course) that you just listed. Use the following scale and circle the appropriate numbers above.

3 = a great deal of time and emphasis
2 = a moderate amount of time and emphasis
1 = a little amount of time and emphasis

4. From the list of curriculum areas or (mini-courses) that you just generated pick the one that you feel you devoted the MOST time and emphasis to.

   Write it here:_____

   Now please list between five and eight concepts that you will highlight because they are MOST important with regard to teaching the topic.

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

5. Below you will see both spaces and numbers. First, with regard to the spaces, please list below two curriculum materials that you feel are basic for the students that you are teaching to read or to learn from.

   A variety of answers is possible. Some of you will list basic texts, some paper or magazine articles, others self- or student-generated materials. BUT FOR WHATEVER YOU LIST, PLEASE GIVE AS COMPLETE A REFERENCE AS POSSIBLE. In the case of news articles and magazines, be as specific as possible.

WRITE THE MOST IMPORTANT FIRST	question 6	question 7
1._____	Reflects My Views	Comprehensive Prep
_____		
_____	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2._____		
_____		
_____	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

Second, with reference to the numbers, refer to questions 6 and 7.

6. How much do you agree with the facts and views presented in the curriculum materials that you just listed? Use the following rating scale and circle the correct number under the column marked question 6 - Reflects My Views.

5 = Agree Strongly
4 = Agree
3 = Undecided
2 = Disagree
1 = Disagree Strongly

7. Do most of your students take the New York State Comprehensive Exam at the end of eleventh grade?

YES_____ NO_____

If yes, how adequately does the curriculum material that you just listed prepare your students for this Comprehensive exam? Use the following scale and circle the correct number under the column marked question 7-Comprehensive Prep.

5 = Extremely Adequate
4 = Adequate
3 = Undecided
2 = Disagree
1 = Disagree Strongly

8. Do you cover the Civil Rights Movement during the year?

YES_____ NO_____

9. If you circled "YES" please list below two curriculum materials that you feel are basic for the students to read or learn from. As in question 5, PLEASE SUPPLY AS COMPLETE A REFERENCE AS POSSIBLE.

WRITE THE MOST IMPORTANT FIRST	question 6	question 7
1._____	Reflects My Views	Comprehensive Prep
_____		
_____	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2._____		
_____		
_____	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

At this point if you are able to provide a copy of some of the basic material that you just listed, clip it to the survey. Examples might be some bit of self- or student-generated material, a magazine article or newspaper clipping or a short section from the text you use.

10. Please read the following passage that has been excerpted from a popular text that is currently in use in some Long Island High Schools:

> "Problems occur even after schools are integrated. For instance, a middle-class child learns from books, toys and visits to friends or relatives, and the conversation of well-educated parents. Thus, before he enters the first grade, he has already had some education. A Slum child, on the other hand, has few of these advantages. His poor parents must struggle hard to earn a living. Often they have little education themselves."

Please circle the number below that best expresses how much you agree with the passage.

Agree Strongly	Agree	Moderate	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
5	4	3	2	1

11. Explain fully why you agreed or disagreed with an aspect of the passage:

12. Do you cover the concepts of educational differences among different social groups?

YES_____ NO_____

13. Most of the students that I teach are:

a. above average
b. average
c. below average
d. college bound (4 year)
e. college or vocational school bound (2 year)
d. other_____

14. The program that I teach in can best be described as:

a. the only high school in the district
b. a small mini high school within a larger district school
c. a small mini high school separated from a larger district high school
d. our school has both a mini school and a larger district school and I teach in the larger district school
e. other_____

Any comments or details to add?

(please don't forget the simple data sheet which follows!)

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

AGE_____ NUMBER YEARS TEACHING SOCIAL STUDIES_____

SEX_____ HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED_____

Below you will find a list of educational objectives. Please indicate to what extent you feel each one reflects your own educational objectives.

	Extremely accurate				Not at all accurate
cognitive (stress on formal thinking)	5	4	3	2	1
perception (sensory awareness)	5	4	3	2	1
moral (stress what is right to believe)	5	4	3	2	1
activism (political and social action)	5	4	3	2	1
aesthetic (stress on individual talent)	5	4	3	2	1
affective (emotional needs and feelings)	5	4	3	2	1
basic skill development	5	4	3	2	1

Here are some adjectives people sometimes use to describe themselves. Would you indicate the extent to which each is accurate in your case according to the following scale:

3 = extremely accurate
2 = moderately accurate
1 = not at all accurate

moderate	3	2	1	indifferent	3	2 1
conservative	3	2	1	pluralist	3	2 1
radical	3	2	1	liberal	3	2 1
democrat	3	2	1	radical right	3	2 1
activist	3	2	1	socialist	3	2 1
humanist	3	2	1	participatory democrat	3	2 1
straight	3	2	1	radical liberal	3	2 1
hippie	3	2	1	counter-culture	3	2 1
reformist	3	2	1	republican	3	2 1
revolutionary	3	2	1			

Appendix: D MAIL FOLLOW-UP

Faculty Development Program
Social Science in the High Schools
SUNY at Stony Brook, New York 11794

June 1976

Dear

Enclosed you will find a number of postcards. There are as many postcards as the number of surveys that our project originally sent you by mail recently.

Normally we would not be sending a follow-up letter until after the return deadline which in this case is JUNE 14, 1976. However, because our project requires that we send the survey to you toward the end of the school year, and because that year is quickly drawing to a close, the follow-up is being conducted before the deadline (and the closing of the schools).

Please, just drop one postcard in the mailbox of each American Studies Social Studies teacher who received a copy of the survey materials.

Because we wish to fully represent the teaching quality and diversity of Long Island districts, we wish to stress, again, how much we appreciate the active participation of both the department chairpeople and the teachers themselves.

Respectfully, for the Project,

Minna Goldfarb Dana Bramel